

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 09/765,830
Page 8 of 12

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated September 25, 2003. In view of the amendments and the following discussion, the Applicant believes that all claims are in allowable form.

REJECTIONS

A. 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 5-14 and 18-29 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,765,444 issued June 16, 1998 to Bacchi et al. (hereinafter Bacchi). The Examiner has also similarly rejected each of the above-identified claims as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,155,768 issued December 5, 2000 to Bacchi et al. (hereinafter Bacchi 2). In response, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11 and 24 to more clearly recite aspects of the invention.

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984)(citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Here, both Bacchi and Bacchi 2 fail to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention recited by Independent claims 1, 11 and 24.

Bacchi and Bacchi 2 teach a wafer transfer device having a main link centrally coupled to a robot base or hub. The main link may be rotated about the hub. At opposite ends of the hub, extension arms are coupled. Each extension arm comprises a first arm coupled to the main link, a second arm coupled to the first arm opposite the main link, and a blade or robot hand coupled to the second arm opposite the first arm. Respective first and second extension motors drive extension arm. The first extension motor is adapted to rotate the first arm, the second arm and blade about an extension

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 09/765,830
Page 9 of 12

arm axis passing through the first arm to main link joint. The second extension motor is adapted to control the extension of the blade relative to the extension arm axis.

Thus, Bacchi and Bacchi 2 do not teach a first extension motor configured to provide controllable simultaneous extension or retraction of a first robot blade and rotation of the first robot blade about a first axis, and a second extension motor configured to provide controllable simultaneous extension or retraction of the second robot blade and rotation of the second robot blade about a second axis, as recited by claims 1 and 11. The structure of recited in the preamble of claim 24 has been similarly amended.

As such, the Applicant submits that claims 1, 11 and 24 are not anticipated as Bacchi and Bacchi 2 do not teach all the limitations of the claimed invention. Thus, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 11 and 24, as amended, and those claims depending therefrom, are patentable over Bacchi and Bacchi 2. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests these rejections be withdrawn.

B. 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over either Bacchi or Bacchi 2, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,968 Issued April 10, 2001 to Hiruma et al. (hereinafter Hiruma). Specifically, the Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious to use a stepper motor for each motor in either of the primary references in view of Hiruma's teachings if it was desired to save weight. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 15 depend either directly or indirectly upon either independent claim 1 or 11 and recite additional features thereof. It has above been discussed and argued that the teachings and disclosure of either Bacchi or Bacchi 2 are insubstantial in forming the basis of an anticipation rejection. Therefore, any attempt at combination of either Bacchi or Bacchi 2 with an additional reference to attack features of dependent claims will not support a conclusion of obviousness. That is, without the control of the extension and rotation of robot blade relative to an axis by a single motor as described

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 09/765,830
Page 10 of 12

and claimed in the independent claims being provided by the secondary reference (e.g., Hiruma), any resultant combination of references will still fail to disclose the claimed invention. In the instant case, Hiruma fails to teach or suggest a first extension motor configured to provide controllable simultaneous extension or retraction of a first robot blade and rotation of the first robot blade about a first axis, and a second extension motor configured to provide controllable simultaneous extension or retraction of the second robot blade and rotation of the second robot blade about a second axis, as recited by claims 1 and 11. Thus, Hiruma may not be utilized to modify the wafer transfer devices of Bacchi and Bacchi 2 to teach or suggest the invention of claims 1 and 11.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of either Bacchi or Bacchi 2 in view of Hiruma does not render claims 1 and 11 obvious. Thus, the Applicant submits that claims 2 and 15, depending respectfully from claims 1 and 11, are patentable over Bacchi or Bacchi 2 in view of Hiruma. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO THE EXAMINER'S COMMENTS

The Examiner has expressed concern over whether the limitations of an arm and a link signify elements that are respectively comprised of a one piece construction. The Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1, 11 and 24 identify the link to include opposite ends having a fixed orientation relative to each other, thereby clarifying the claimed structure of the link. Additionally, the structure coupled to each end of the arms identified to more clearly define the arms. The claims have also been clarified to clearly claim the motion provided to the blade by each extension motor. Thus, the Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, now clearly recite a method and structure that is unanticipated by the cited art.

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 09/765,830
Page 11 of 12

CONCLUSION

The Applicant submits that all of these claims now pending in the application fully satisfy all requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant now earnestly solicits reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue.

If, however, the Examiner believes that any unresolved issues still exist in any of these claims that require a continuance of the adverse final action therefor, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Keith Taboada at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Nov 25, 2003



Keith P. TABOADA
Reg. No. 45,150
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 09/765,830
Page 12 of 12

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile under 37 C.F.R. §1.8 on November 25, 2003 and is addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Arlington, VA 22313-1450, Facsimile No: (703) 872-9327.

Allyson M. DeVesty
Signature
Allyson M. DeVesty
Printed Name of Person Signing
11-25-03
Date of signature

BEST AVAILABLE COPY